

Criteria for Local Educational Agency Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Determinations

For the 2016 determinations, the Department of Public Instruction used a point-based system combining the performance of Local Educational Agencies (LEA) on compliance indicators and results indicators.

Scoring of the Compliance Indicators

- All LEAs receive scores for the following indicators: 4B, 9, and 10.
- LEAs in the procedural compliance self-assessment (PCSA) receive scores for Indicator 11.
- LEAs with early childhood programs receive scores for Indicator 12.
- LEAs that serve students with disabilities that are 16 and older receive a score for Indicator 13.
- All LEAs also receive scores for the percentage of findings of noncompliance that are corrected within one year, and percentage of data reported that is timely and accurate.

Scoring of the Results Indicators

- LEAs with students in the 4-year cohort receive scores for Indicator 1.
- LEAs with students in grades 7-12 receive a score for Indicator 2.
- All LEAs with students in tested grades (3-8 and 10) receive scores for 3B and 3C in reading and math.

Indicator / Topic	2 points	1 point	0 points
1	At least 85% of students with disabilities in a 4 year cohort graduated from high school with a regular diploma.	70-84.99% of students with disabilities in a 4 year cohort graduated from high school with a regular diploma.	Less than 70% of students with disabilities in a 4-year cohort graduated from high school with a regular diploma.
2	Less than 0.5% of students with disabilities in grades 7-12 dropped out of school (when adjusted for exclusionary conditions*).	0.5% - 1.0% students with disabilities in grades 7-12 dropped out of school (when adjusted for exclusionary conditions*).	Greater than 1.0% of students with disabilities in grades 7-12 dropped out of school (when adjusted for exclusionary conditions*).
3B Math	At least 90% of students with IEPs participated in the Badger exam.	85% - 89.99% of students with IEPs participated in the Badger exam.	Less than 85% of students with IEPs participated in the Badger exam.
3B Reading	At least 90% of students with IEPs participated in the Badger exam.	85% - 89.99% of students with IEPs participated in the Badger exam.	Less than 85% of students with IEPs participated in the Badger exam.
3C Math	At least 20% of students with IEPs scored proficient or advanced on the Badger exam and DLM** math assessment.	15% - 19.99% of students with IEPs scored proficient or advanced on the Badger exam and DLM** math assessment.	Less than 15% of students with IEPs scored proficient or advanced on the Badger exam and DLM** math assessment.
3C Reading	At least 25% of students with IEPs scored proficient or advanced on the Badger exam and DLM** English Language Arts assessment.	17% - 24.99% of students with IEPs scored proficient or advanced on the Badger exam and DLM** English Language Arts assessment.	Less than 17% of students with IEPs scored proficient or advanced on the Badger exam and DLM** English Language Arts assessment.

Indicator / Topic	2 points	1 point	0 points
4B	<p>LEA not identified as having a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs.</p> <p><i>OR</i></p> <p>LEA not identified as having a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p>		<p>LEA identified as having a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p>
9	<p>LEA not identified as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services.</p> <p><i>OR</i></p> <p>LEA not identified as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services <u>that is the result of inappropriate identification.</u></p>		<p>LEA identified as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p>
10	<p>LEA not identified as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories.</p> <p><i>OR</i></p> <p>LEA not identified as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories <u>that is the result of inappropriate identification.</u></p>		<p>LEA identified as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p>

Indicator / Topic	2 points	1 point	0 points
11	At least 90% of children were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation.	75%-89.99% of children were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation.	Less than 75% of children were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation.
12	At least 90% of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	75%-89.99% of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	Less than 75% of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
13	At least 90% of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above have an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There is also evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.	75%-89.99% of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above have an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There is also evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.	Less than 75% of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above have an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There is also evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.
Percentage of noncompliance findings corrected within one year	At least 95% of findings of noncompliance are corrected not later than one year from identification.	75%-94.99% of findings of noncompliance are corrected not later than one year from identification.	Less than 75% of findings of noncompliance are corrected not later than one year from identification.
Percentage of reported data that is timely and accurate	At least 95% of data reported by the LEA to the department are timely and accurate.	75%-94.99% of data reported by the LEA to the department are timely and accurate.	Less than 75% of data reported by the LEA to the department are timely and accurate.

*Indicator 2 Exclusionary Conditions: transfer to another public school district, private school, or state- or district-approved educational program; temporary absence due to expulsion, suspension or school-approved illness; death.

**Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) is the alternate assessment for the Badger exam.

2016-2018 LEA Determinations Weights

In 2016, the department has begun including Results indicators in its LEA Determinations. The weight given to Results indicators will increase each year from 2016 to 2018, until 50% of the score comes from Compliance and 50% comes from Results. The table below shows the weights for Compliance and Results that will be used.

2016 LEA Determination	2017 LEA Determination	2018 LEA Determination
90% Compliance 10% Results	75% Compliance 25% Results	50% Compliance 50% Results

2016 LEA Determinations Criteria

The Compliance Score is the total Compliance points received divided by the possible Compliance points earned.

The Results Score is the total Results points received divided by the possible Results points earned.

Using the weights of 90% Compliance and 10% Results, the 2016 Total Score is calculated with the following formula:

$$(\text{Compliance Score} \times 0.90) + (\text{Results Score} \times 0.10)$$

LEA Determination	Criteria
Meets Requirements	Total Score is at least 80%*
Needs Assistance	Total Score is between 60%* and 80%*
Needs Intervention	Total Score is less than 60%*
Needs Substantial Intervention	The department determines, at any time, an LEA needs substantial intervention in implementing the requirements of IDEA Part B or that there is a substantial failure to comply with any condition of eligibility under this part.

*Following the methodology used by OSEP in state determinations, Total Score will be rounded up by 0.5% (for example, scores of 79.5% will be rounded to 80%).